

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

---

MAURICE SEYMORE,

Plaintiff,

- against -

DEPARTMENT OF CORR SERVICES, ET AL.,

Defendants.

---

11 Civ. 2254 (JGK)

MEMORANDUM OPINION  
AND ORDER

JOHN G. KOELTL, District Judge:

The plaintiff has made another application to appoint counsel. This motion is **denied without prejudice** for failure to make the required showing. The Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit has articulated factors that should guide the Court's discretion to appoint counsel to represent an indigent civil litigant under 28 U.S.C. § 1915. See Hodge v. Police Officers, 802 F.2d 58, 61-62 (2d Cir. 1986); Jackson v. Moscicki, No. 99 Civ. 2427, 2000 WL 511642, at \*4 (S.D.N.Y. Apr. 27, 2000). For the Court to order the appointment of counsel, the plaintiff must, as a threshold matter, demonstrate that the claim has substance or a likelihood of success on the merits. See Hodge, 802 F.2d at 60-61. Only then can the Court consider the other factors appropriate to determination of whether counsel should be appointed: "plaintiff's ability to obtain representation independently, and [her] ability to handle the case without

assistance in the light of the required factual investigation, the complexity of the legal issues, and the need for expertly conducted cross-examination to test veracity." Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co., Inc., 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989). As in his previous motions, the plaintiff has not made any showing that his claim is likely to succeed on the merits. The plaintiff's application for the Court to appoint counsel is therefore **denied without prejudice** for failure to make the required showing at this time.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York  
November 15, 2013

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
John G. Koeltl  
United States District Judge